

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

December 8, 2016
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Zahn, Commissioners Bishop, Chirls, Lampe, Larrivee, Woosley

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Wu

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Transportation Department

OTHERS PRESENT: Chris Breiland, Don Samdahl, Fehr & Peers

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Chair Zahn who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Larrivee, who arrived at 6:39 p.m., and Commissioner Wu, who was excused.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT - None

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chirls and the motion carried unanimously.

5. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None

6. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. November 10, 2016

A motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chirls and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Lampe abstained from voting.

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Multimodal Level of Service

Chris Breiland, consultant with Fehr & Peers, noted that the recommended standards for pedestrian LOS had not been changed from the last MMLOS Workshop on September 22, or how they are measured. He said the arterial crossing frequency is a guideline to indicate where it may be desirable to have crossings, though their actual locations and design will be studied

through the Transportation. Similarly, the bicycle LOS recommendations were also unchanged.

Mr. Breiland commented that there was some discussion at the last meeting about the viability of bike lanes. He said in the opinion of the consultants and the staff, particularly on streets with lower vehicle speed and volume streets, there is quite a lot of research to indicate that bike lanes do provide a more comfortable environment for the average bicyclist, leading to higher roadway utilization by people riding bicycles. As roads get busier and have faster traffic, the viability of bicycle lanes as a low-stress design diminishes.

Commissioner Bishop pointed out that the category of traffic volumes of less than 3000 and traffic speeds of less than 25 miles per hour applies to almost every local street in the city. Few if any non-arterial local streets see more than 3000 trips per day. Don Samdahl, consultant with Fehr & Peers, agreed such instances would be rare, and in such cases it would be perfectly appropriate to have no bike marking at all.

Chair Zahn said it was her understanding from reading the recommended bicycle LOS street methodology chart that for streets with speeds of 25 miles per hour or less that have less than 3000 daily trips, no marking and sharrows are not appropriate for reaching the least experienced riders. Mr. Breiland confirmed her understanding. He said as volumes increase, even where the vehicle speeds remain the same, the breakouts between LOS 2 and LOS 3 occur. He said 108th Avenue SE, particularly to the south of Bellevue Way, has volumes in the 3000 to 7000 range, whereas closer to Bellcrest the volumes may exceed 7000. The busier the street, the less comfortable riders are unless they have a designated space.

Mr. Breiland said a street with a standard LOS designation of 3 could trigger new development to add a bike lane if one does not already exist. Senior Planner Kevin McDonald clarified that while a single development would not be required to provide a bike lane fronting only their property if it would not connect to any other facilities, the development would still be required to anticipate the coming of a bike lane and set their curbs and structures accordingly.

Mr. McDonald said following the last meeting, he and Commissioner Wu had a long talk about striped bike lanes. He said her opinion was that striped bike lanes are useless, and she indicated she would not feel comfortable riding in such a lane under any circumstance. She said her default would be a buffered bike lane and her preference would be a protected bike lane. He said he suggested leaving the tool in the toolbox and apply it judiciously where the traffic speed and volume criteria makes sense, which is the staff recommendation.

Chair Zahn said except in the instance where traffic volumes are less than 3000 and traffic speeds are 25 miles per hour or less, a LOS 2 would not be appropriate.

Commissioner Larrivee pointed out that the range of riders between Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) 1 and LTS 4 represents a spectrum, not absolutes. One does not suddenly move from being a comfort on a LOS 1 facility to a LOS 2. He said his impression was that while some LTS 2 riders may not feel comfortable with sharrows, but most do. The chart is a model and cannot possibly reflect absolute reality.

Commissioner Chirls agreed and said the approach represents a broad brush quick and easy way to categorize bicycle rider comfort in various situations. Any categorization will have a lot of faults in it. There is, however, another dimension that is not really captured by the model, namely context. For example, there may be children of a certain age who according to their parents are LTS 1s but who in their own minds are LTS 2s. If the context is commuting to school, the city may want to purposefully overcompensate and provide the safest facility possible. Mr. Samdahl agreed and said other contextual factors include grade, how straight a

road is, and how wide a street is.

Mr. Breiland said the proposed bicycle LOS standards are intended to indicate the minimum facilities that are appropriate for different types of system users based on the best research available.

Chair Zahn said her only hesitation was that the standards could be misinterpreted. As drafted, the chart suggests that riders who consider themselves to be a LTS 2 can be satisfied by only putting in striped bike lanes. That could give the false sense that that is good enough and that no more money needs to be spent on something like protected bike lanes.

Commissioner Chirls said there needs to be some other dimension that is context appropriate. One example would be intended use, such as recreation, school or commuting.

Commissioner Bishop suggested that that information could be overlaid on top of the proposal. Mr. Breiland agreed. He said the LOS metrics and standards can stand on their own. Where context would come in would be where the city chooses to update the bike master plan. The standards provide the underlying framework, and the context sits on top to inform what the system should look like in making logical connections. To put all of the context into a LOS criteria would defeat the initial direction to not make things so complicated that it becomes impossible to manage.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested that language should be included with the tool indicating that the standards represent minimums. While that is implied when talking about intersection levels of service, the chart looks different from what folks are used to, thus it would be worthwhile to include language emphasizing that the tool shows minimums.

Commissioner Woosley agreed and said it would also help to have clear definitions of what LTS 1,2,3 and 4 stands for. He pointed out that those wanting to operate a motor vehicle must demonstrate a minimum level of understanding of the laws and how to operate a vehicle in order to become licensed. The same does not hold true for bicycles, thus there are a broad range of competencies and varied levels of confidence represented by those who are riding bicycles on the streets of Bellevue. Mr. Breiland pointed out that the categories of bicycle riders (LTS 1-4) were identified in a previous presentation during the September 22 MMLOS workshop, and added that as the material gets developed into a full report, the categories will be clearly defined along with how the levels of service break out, how the city streets currently score against the standards, and how the Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program improvements will change things.

Mr. Breiland pointed out that bicyclists need to cross streets along designated corridors. Bike lanes that end well before an intersection leave riders out in the mix, which is not comfortable, particularly for those who are less confident riding with traffic. The recommended crossing methodology outlines specific along-the-road accommodations for each bike LOS. Where a bike facility crosses an intersection, there needs to be a reasonable level of separation and protection for riders to maintain the LOS standard for the corridor. For LOS 1 facilities, a “Dutch intersection” design keeps riders from having to merge across lanes of traffic; the solution fits in existing intersection footprints and easily adapts to existing treatments. The treatment is already in place at 108th Avenue NE and NE 4th Street, and on Main Street at Bellevue Way.

Commissioner Woosley asked if it is possible to have a signal activator for bicycles located back 100 feet or more from the crosswalk. He said currently riders must come right up to the intersection in order to activate the signal. A queue of cars lines up behind the rider, and as

soon as the light turns green the faster cars must go around the rider in an unsafe manner. Activating the signal earlier could let the queue of cars take off earlier. Mr. Breiland said the situation described involves a dedicated bike lane in between two vehicle lanes. Signal activation for bicycles is put nominally in the same place as for cars, and while there could be cars on either side of the rider, there would be no cars in front of the rider. Commissioner Woosley said where the bike lane continues through, there is no issue. In many cases, however, the lane does not continue through and a conflict is created. Mr. Breiland said the standard practice is to put bikes in front of the cars in what is called a bike box which sits right behind the crosswalk. Riders make their way to the front to the box in order to maximize their visibility. The design has been adopted by most agencies for that very reason and is the idea behind the Dutch intersection.

Commissioner Bishop noted that LOS 1 facilities are for the least experienced and confident riders, which is what there are the most of in the city. Under the proposal, any intersection with a side street that comes up to an arterial will have to have a bike signal, a leading bicycle phase or other bike-favorable signal timing. That could mean spending as much as \$10,000 per intersection to upgrade. Mr. Breiland pointed out that only a handful of intersections are classified as LOS 1. Chair Zahn pointed out that an LOS 2 intersection would need all the same facilities. Mr. Breiland agreed but said that still would not represent a majority of the signals. The focus is on where designated facilities cross arterials. Most of the network that has been defined is LOS 3.

Mr. McDonald said the approach guarantees that the comfort level of riders along a street is perpetuated across intersections. It is not prescriptive, it is context appropriate, and is intended to protect the vulnerable users of the transportation system, which matches the Commission's recommendation for Vision Zero and what the Council approved on December 5. In order to provide the protection needed for bicyclists, it is necessary to go a bit out of the way to provide the facilities that will make them reasonably comfortable in a mixed traffic environment.

Mr. Breiland referenced 2nd Avenue in Seattle where there are bicycle signal heads on every intersection, not just the turning streets. The repeatable pattern gives cyclists the confidence to look for the bike signals. The repetition and knowing what to expect has a lot to do with comfort. All of Seattle's cycle tracks will eventually be moving in that direction as well. Crossing methodology is an emerging field and the cities that are leading the charge have started to adopt similar standards.

Chair Zahn said it was hard to envision how the methodologies would play out without a map. Mr. Breiland noted that the bicycle system map was included in the materials for the September 22 MMLOS workshop, and that given the length of time since then, should have been included in the materials for tonight's meeting.

Commissioner Woosley asked if the approach would be applied to all streets in the city or just to the identified bicycle corridors. Mr. Breiland said it would be applicable only to the latter. Not all streets can accommodate all modes comfortably. What is important is the network of streets that work together to accomplish the goals. Commissioner Woosley stressed the need to know and understand the associated impacts and balance them out in moving forward.

Commissioner Bishop asked why LOS 4 was not included on the crossing methodologies chart. Mr. Breiland explained that the traditional signal meets LOS 4. Mr. McDonald said LOS 4 is the default if nothing is done, thus the chart does not need to reflect LOS 4. Mr. Breiland agreed and said facilities that are not on the bike network are by definition LOS 4.

Mr. Breiland pointed out that a number of changes were made to the recommended transit LOS

standards based on input from the Commission. First, the table was simplified to focus on local stops, primary stops, and frequent transit/RapidRide stops. Each stop is defined based on boarding activity and transit frequency. The components include weather protection, seating, transit landing zones and wayfinding. Landing zones are free spaces to accommodate boarding and alighting riders.

Chair Zahn observed that the seating at local stops is noted as applying to retail, healthcare and senior housing. As more Bellevue schools are using transit, it might be appropriate to recognize that stops associated with schools should also have seating. Mr. Breiland agreed.

Commissioner Lampe asked if any bus stops should have shelters if they have fewer than 25 daily boardings. Mr. Breiland said that is King County Metro's threshold. On many of the core routes boardings that exceed 25 per day are common, but there are many local routes in the city that have only a handful of daily boardings.

Commissioner Larrivee commented that often the stops that have the fewest boardings have the fewest buses serving them. Persons using those stops are likely to be transit-dependent and may have mobility issues, making those stops appropriate places for seating. Mr. Breiland said there are cost and utilization factors at play. He agreed that ideally seating would be associated with every bus stop where they will receive a reasonable amount of use.

Commissioner Woosley said the argument made by King County Metro is that they cannot afford to provide shelter stops on the Eastside. The reality is that the Eastside pays \$2 for every \$1 of service received, and ships \$1 out for every \$1 received. The Eastside is paying for the shelters via taxes but is not getting them based on policy choices made by the King County Council.

Chair Zahn suggested the local stop standard for weather protection could be a simple number like 25 boardings, or it could be where they are needed. Commissioner Chirls pointed out that stops where there is very little volume are most likely to be changed or otherwise impacted by budget cutbacks or changing routes. Stops that have 25 or more daily boardings are more appropriate locations for additional infrastructure.

Commissioner Larrivee stressed that the recommended standards are only minimums. Mr. Breiland said the standards will in most cases be triggered by development.

Mr. Breiland pointed out that the recommended transit speed LOS standards were unchanged from the previous review by the Commission. He said the standards were based on the target speeds from the Transit Master Plan and are consistent with the King County Metro long-range plan. They are focused on the Frequent Transit Network connections between activity centers. Over time, the standard seeks to provide a transit speed between activity centers of at least 14 miles per hour.

Commissioner Bishop voiced support for the standards based on his understanding of them and how they will play out. He suggested the Commission may want to reserve the right to revisit all of the standards as things move forward.

Commissioner Woosley suggested the standards may actually short change the people who actually commute by bike on a regular basis by not having a standard that requires facilities for the demonstrated demand at peak commute times. The standards could mean too much emphasis will be placed on accommodating the fair weather riders who only go out occasionally. At the New Technologies in Transportation forum on December 2, the focus in part was on how the city can plan to accommodate them. Many were saying there will be a

fleet of autonomous vehicles that operate somewhere between a bus operated by a private transit agency and a privately owned SOV. He suggested that a placeholder should be included to plan for those outcomes by way of motor courts and street pullouts. Mr. McDonald said those particular elements are not related to multimodal LOS but are actually embedded in the street standards of the Downtown Transportation Plan.

Mr. McDonald said there will be a two-phase rollout. In the first phase there will be a series of maps created that put the various components in place. The second phase will involve implementation and prioritization, and that will require an entirely different conversation. At intersections where there are bus stops, pedestrian and bike facilities, and a need to maintain vehicle LOS, it may not be possible to do it all. Consideration will need to be given to what happens in such instances.

Mr. Breiland said the notion of establishing a vehicle LOS for “Vehicle Priority Corridors” had not previously been talked about. He said the approach is not intended to replace the MMAs that are used to evaluate concurrency. The idea is to create a complementary system to help define describe the experience of drivers that can be used to prioritize investments to improve the driver experience. There may be some alignment with system intersections that are having issues under the concurrency framework, but the corridor LOS approach is not intended to serve as a new way to evaluate concurrency or to introduce a new concurrency standard.

Continuing, Mr. Breiland said the Commission previously stated that the MMAs and the system intersection V/C ratios do not adequately describe the experience of the driver. He said the consultants worked with staff to come up with a new performance measure to do that. The Downtown Transportation Plan has the concept of auto-focused streets, and that concept was taken and stretched out across the entire city to define vehicle priority corridors across the community, allowing for focusing on what the experience is in traveling along the corridors and in logical sections.

There are two ways to measure the potential vehicle LOS. One way would be to use average travel speed along corridors. The average speed metric would be based on a percentage of the speed limit, with the LOS thresholds taken from the Highway Capacity Manual. The other way would be to calculate the average volume to capacity ratio at system intersections and averaging them along logical sections of corridors. Travel speed is a more understandable metric for the public to grasp. Calculating average travel speeds would require a new data collection effort on the part of the city. While the city’s travel model can be used to estimate speeds, there are other tools available that would work better. Both staff and the consultant team recommend utilizing the travel speed metric.

The Commissioners were shown a chart indicating how the average vehicle speed and average V/C methods might be applied to the typical A-F level of service methodology. Mr. Breiland noted that both the average speeds and average V/C ratio were from the Highway Capacity Manual, and said that for each LOS level a qualitative description had been added.

Commissioner Lampe asked how going to an average speed methodology would interplay with the current concurrency requirements. Mr. Breiland explained that if the speed-based metric was in place as a standard, along with existing v/c concurrency standards, if the speeds on a road were forecast to fall below the standard, the city would not be in compliance with the concurrency standard. Mr. Samdahl said several jurisdictions have corridor-based concurrency requirements based on speed or average intersection delay. The approach is in some respects not much different from the MMA approach, except that it is based on average vehicle speed along a corridor.

Commissioner Bishop said the approach is dependent on the number of traffic signals and what is going on at each signalized intersection within each segment. The question is how to define the segments, which could be from midblock to midblock or from signal to signal. Mr. Breiland said the Highway Capacity Manual gives some guidance and contemplates measuring segments from signalized intersection to signalized intersection. The Manual recommends that the segments not be too short. He said no attempt has been made to divide up the city into recommended segments, but adoption of the methodology would mean that exercise would have to be undertaken.

Commissioner Chirls said he has not read the Highway Capacity Manual and asked if the outlined approach could handle a situation like downtown Bellevue, which is relatively speaking a very small area and in which two blocks in one direction may be very congested while the two blocks feeding the first two blocks are relatively uncongested. Mr. Breiland explained that the Highway Capacity Manual outlines how to measure the experience of the driver, but offers not prescriptions for how to deal with it. There are ample tools to address situations like the one described by factoring in the bottleneck locations and taking advantage of the segments that are more free flowing.

Commissioner Woosley asked about the practicality of implementing the methodology. He suggested that the 150th Avenue SE corridor that spans I-90 might offer a good test case. Mr. Breiland said that would be a good option. With regard to manageability from the perspective of the staff, he said it would not take much effort to collect the existing conditions data. With the data in hand, it would be easier to identify trouble spots and possible mitigation solutions as development occurs. The staff would need to delve into the budget implications and their ability to move forward on the forecasting side.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that the intent of the methodology is not to change the concurrently standards, which are based on the V/C averages by MMA. The approach is intended to gain a better understanding of the driver's experience and to prioritize investments to achieve travel speed performance.

Commissioner Bishop said drivers on SE 38th Street in Eastgate currently three to five signal cycles to get through the intersection with 150th Avenue SE. That is something that would show up instantly as a dramatic reduction in travel speed.

Chair Zahn suggested the Vehicle Priority Corridor map will identify the corridors to be addressed. She said there are congested corridors adjacent to neighborhoods that are creating problems for the neighborhoods, Eastgate being one example. Mr. Breiland said the vehicle priority corridors preliminarily identified are the highest volume corridors in the city, and they serve to connect activity centers. More corridors could be added as they are identified, being careful to avoid giving vehicle priority to all corridors. One option would be to set thresholds for all corridors and focusing first on the corridors that get used the most.

Commissioner Lampe asked what the median volumes are for the proposed vehicle priority corridors. Mr. Breiland said he did not have an exact number but suggested it would be in the range of 20,000 vehicles per day.

Commissioner Larrivee asked if it would be possible to color code the map to show the Frequent Transit Network and the Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program. Mr. Breiland agreed to do that.

Mr. Breiland suggested that applying the multimodal LOS metrics and standards to Bellevue Way represents a good representation of the complete streets policy. He noted that the

standards for each mode can simultaneously be achieved and mutually support each other to improve mobility. Put another way, they are not mutually exclusive. There will always need to be tradeoffs and compromises, but they primarily will be at the margins rather than having to choose one or the other.

The sidewalk standard for pedestrian LOS varies depending on the surrounding context. In the case of Bellevue Way, three of the five context areas that apply across the city come into play. Pedestrian destinations cover the entire stretch because Bellevue Way is part of the Frequent Transit Network as defined in the Transit Master Plan. What that means is the sidewalk must be a foot wider than the citywide default. There is also a roadway section that serves Northtowne, which is a neighborhood shopping center which triggers additional sidewalk width, and a section that serves the downtown where the Downtown Transportation Plan standards apply. For the most part, the intersections are those envisioned by the design standards, but in the downtown the idea of enhanced and exceptional intersections comes into play. Along the route there are places where the pedestrian LOS standards define the need for midblock crossings. The Downtown Transportation Plan defines specific crossing locations, including the existing pedestrian bridge over Bellevue Way between NE 8th Street and NE 6th Street. There is currently no crossing to connect to the Northtowne Shopping Center to the west side of the street and the recommended standards would dictate the need for one. Another crossing will be needed in the neighborhood of NE 18th Street given the context of having a bus stop pair at that location once the Frequent Transit Network is implemented.

Commissioner Lampe said he supports walkability but suggested additional midblock crossings could impact vehicular traffic flow. Commissioner Bishop noted that between NE 10th Street and NE 4th Street any crossing would be elevated according to the downtown standards. The crossings between Main Street and NE 2nd Street and between NE 2nd Street and NE 4th Street would be at grade, however. Mr. Breiland noted that the specific crossing treatment design is yet to be determined for those locations. The need is identified in the Downtown Transportation Plan, but there are still engineering questions to be addressed. Commissioner Bishop clarified that the Downtown Transportation Plan does not indicate a specific need for the crossings, rather the potential location for them should the need arise.

Commissioner Woosley suggested that sidewalk width is more of a design standard than a level of service issue. Level of service for pedestrians is related more to mobility and being able to get a crossing signal once the button is pushed. Mr. Breiland said level of service is generally defined as the experience of the person using a particular mode. For pedestrians that includes how quickly a signal responds, and it also relates to sidewalk accommodations relative to the urban form.

With regard to bicycle LOS, Mr. Breiland noted that there are no bicycle facilities planned on Bellevue Way. At the beginning of the process, Bellevue Way was exempted as a corridor for bicycle LOS because it is not a great bicycle facility due to high traffic speed and volume. There is a great bicycle corridor opportunity on 108th Avenue, which is defined in the bicycle master plan as a priority bicycle corridor; it generally runs parallel to Bellevue Way and then transitions to 112th Avenue NE. In the downtown, 106th Avenue NE is defined as a bicycle corridor as well. The bicycle corridors in the downtown area are designed to provide for east/west and north/south connectivity.

The Commissioners were shown a map indicating bicycle LOS crossing treatments. Mr. Breiland commented that NE 24th Street was shown as a standard bicycle corridor, which is defined as a LOS 3 with a LOS 3 crossing treatment, meaning there would be sharrows stamped in the street, and an offset right-turn lane where needed. Similar conditions were shown on the map at NE 2nd Street, but LOS 1 facilities were identified at NE 12th Street and

Main Street because they are defined as bicycle priority corridors. In activity centers like the downtown, the LOS was defined as LOS 1. NE 12th Street already has LOS 1 facilities, including a shared-use path, though the present crossing does not meet the LOS 1 standards.

With regard to transit LOS on Bellevue Way, Mr. Breiland said the Transit Master Plan identifies two Frequent Transit Network routes, one north of Downtown and the other south of Downtown. He shared with the Commissioners a map showing the location of the transit stop pairs that currently exist which should have frequent transit network passenger accommodations in the form of shelters and seating along with larger landing zones. The pedestrian LOS standards call for wider sidewalks within 100 feet of transit stop pairs. There are already sidewalks on Bellevue Way, but there may be a need for sidewalks on some of the side streets that approach the transit stop intersections. The Transit Master Plan also identifies intersection improvements such as queue jump lanes, transit signal priority, and a southbound HOV lane on the southern end of Bellevue Way, all of which are specifically identified for improving transit speed.

Mr. Breiland shared with the Commissioners a slide showing both the current average vehicle speeds on Bellevue Way and the V/C ratios from the BKR model for the PM peak period. He broke the Bellevue Way corridor into three logical segments: from NE 12th Street north to SR-520, the downtown core, and Main Street south to I-90. He explained that the current LOS standard for Northtowne and Enatai is 0.85, while in the downtown the LOS standard is 0.95. Intersections in the downtown have current V/C readings ranging from 0.51 to 0.74, which indicated a very acceptable level-of-service but does not mesh with the experience of most drivers. The speed measure actually does a better job of capturing what is going on; the average rush hour speed is only seven miles per hour.

Commissioner Chirls pointed out that the approach does not address the impact of construction. In the downtown, construction trucks do not arrive until after the morning commute is finished, but they are then all over the place in the downtown. On many days, speeds of seven miles per hour is a dream come true. The measurements need to be taken at hours other than the peak hours, particularly in the downtown. Bellevue's downtown is unique in that it is so small. It has experienced one development after another for several years, and often has several developments under way at the same time, and the result has been a very large impact on vehicular traffic. Measurements taken only during peak hours address the needs of employees to get to work, but not the issues faced by those who live in the downtown.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested the issue is really related to what can or should be done to mitigate construction impacts. He said that topic could use some additional discussion at some point down the road.

Mr. Breiland said southbound Bellevue Way traffic between Main Street and I-90 averages about eight miles per hour during the evening peak period. The problem relates mostly to I-90 itself, the meters and the general lack of space on the freeway. The V/C ratio of 0.67 at 112th Avenue SE does not highlight the problem, but the vehicle speed measure does. Widening southbound Bellevue Way would serve to move the queue southward to the waiting point sooner, but drivers will still have to wait the same amount of time. Traffic heading for I-90 has few options, but traffic heading to the Enatai neighborhood could select other modes and other streets.

Commissioner Woosley said he lives in Enatai and along with his wife commutes down Bellevue Way or 112th Avenue SE to get home. The good news is that I-90 will eventually have a new westbound lane once the HOV lane is opened and that new capacity will help. In addition to the limited capacity on I-90, I-405 is one of the big contributors to arterial

congestion and there should be a push for a full build-out of the I-405 master plan. The downtown generates a great deal of trips and the city has the responsibility to understand how much traffic the entire system, including city streets, can handle.

The final slide showed to the Commissioners put the various mode options together. Mr. Breiland pointed out the frequent transit stop pair on either side of the street at Bellevue Way and NE 12th Street along with a LOS 1 bicycle intersection and a Transit Master Plan transit priority treatment. He said the question is whether or not all the pieces could be made to fit in the space and how the result for pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes would impact the vehicle LOS, and what compromises may need to be made. Layering the elements together can be done over time along the Bellevue Way corridor to yield a system that accommodates pedestrians, bicycles and transit while keeping in mind vehicle LOS. There will naturally be tradeoffs to consider, and a need to determine which should be funded first.

Commissioner Chirls said the work provides a more complete view of the multimodal issues. He reiterated the need to take measurements at different times of the day to determine the actual impacts. Mr. Breiland suggested that if the vehicle speed level of service idea is adopted, it could be moved into more of a SEPA implementation that would not conflict with the v/c metric for concurrency. Level of service can be used for more than just planning, it can also be used for environmental review and mitigation.

Commissioner Bishop asked where the average vehicle speed data through the downtown came from. Mr. Breiland said the consultant team obtained the data from Inrix. Commissioner Bishop suggested the impact of the two potential at-grade mid-block crosswalks at the southern end of Bellevue Way could be taken into account relative to how they would affect vehicle speed in that segment. Mr. Samdahl agreed. Mr. Breiland said that would entail making assumptions about how often the crossings would be triggered and layer that into the travel time. That could be done as a matter of planning and traffic signal operations.

Commissioner Larrivee said he was excited about the direction the study is taking things. Mr. Breiland said the consulting team was seeking the Commission's concurrence relative to the metrics and standards for all of the modes. Nothing has been written in stone and things will likely change over time.

Chair Zahn asked the Commissioners to provide their feedback off line in the interest of time.

Commissioner Woosley argued against using LOS for the freeways. He also proposed adding to the map failing intersections as an additional layer.

A motion to extend the meeting for fifteen minutes was made by Commissioner Lampe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bishop and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Larrivee abstained from voting.

8. OLD BUSINESS – None

9. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. McDonald said then Chair Lampe introduced the Downtown Transportation Plan to the City Council on October 7, 2013, following which the Council gave direction to implement it, a process that has since been under way in the form of building projects and establishing policy. The intent was to sync with the Downtown Livability Initiative and to do one update to the subarea plan that included land use and transportation. Just a couple of months ago, the livability process concluded that it will not generate any policies, rather that work will result in

changes to the Downtown land use code. The transportation policies will need to move forward on their own for adoption in 2017 as part of the annual Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle. Given the passage of three years, it would be good for the Commission to review the proposed policies to determine if any non-substantive revisions are needed.

Commissioner Woosley said it appears the Downtown Livability Initiative update will significantly depart from what the adopted codes and plans were originally. He asked how that changed circumstance fits with the proposed transportation policies. Commissioner Chirls suggested that some of the points made earlier relate to the issue. The Planning Commission is the body that has been wrestling with the rezoning issues. The Transportation Commission is not talking to that body about the impact their proposals will have on the transportation system. There needs to be some way for the two groups to have a conversation.

Chair Zahn said she talked with the chair of the Planning Commission when presenting Vision Zero to the City Council. The Council praised the fact that the two commissions worked together to come up with the Vision Zero recommendations. The two commissions should continue working proactively together.

Commissioner Bishop expressed concern that the policies recommended by the Commission are based on a body of work that the Planning Commission is considering making changes to. Mr. McDonald said the body of work is based on a 2030 land use forecast of population and employment irrespective of zoning. Should the Planning Commission decide that buildings up to 600 feet tall should be permitted, the underlying assumptions about the forecasts would not change given that the same increases in population and employment would occur, just in taller buildings. A model analysis has been done that retained the 2030 baseline and moved the growth around to potentially taller buildings in the heart of the downtown and to areas adjacent to the freeway, and the result was only a minor amount of difference in the traffic level of service. In part, by shifting growth closer to the freeway, the distance people must travel in the downtown to get to and from the freeway becomes shorter, thus potentially reducing traffic stress in the core.

Commissioner Bishop stressed the fact that modeling for buildout is not the way transportation planning is done. All planning is predicated on the number of people and the number of jobs in a particular zone at an estimated period of time. Mr. McDonald concurred, noting that modeling assumptions may change over time.

Chair Zahn asked staff to be prepared to share context and additional information when the issue comes back before the Commission.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

11. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Lampe announced that he had been appointed to the citizen oversight panel for Sound Transit representing the Eastside. He said he would provide the Commission with regular updates.

Commissioner Bishop reported that on December 6 he attended the Washington State Department of Transportation executive advisory group meeting focused on the I-405 corridor planning efforts. He said the advisory group is composed of mayors and councilmembers from cities up and down the I-405 corridor from Renton to Lynnwood. At the meeting, WSDOT, Sound Transit and the King County Parks folks made presentations about what is going on in the corridor in terms of hot lanes in the north end, and construction of the hot lanes on the

south end between Bellevue and Renton. Sound Transit reported on how it will cooperate with WSDOT in terms of bus rapid transit, and King County Parks reported on their Eastside Rail Corridor planning efforts and the upcoming implementation phase.

Commissioner Lampe said a lot of information was shared at the Transportation Technology seminar on December 2. It was exciting to hear Bellevue talk about the possibility of an autonomous circulator.

Chair Zahn reported that she would be attending the Transportation Research Board conference the second week of January and said she would provide the Commission with a report.

Commissioner Woosley reported that the Council has approved funding for a full-time position for transportation technology staff. That person could help as part of the Eastgate area early implementation actions. Commissioner Bishop clarified that the staff position will come from the city's budget, not from levy funds. Mr. McDonald pointed out that levy funds will be used to fund staff to plan for and implement projects.

11. STAFF REPORTS – As Noted

12. COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald reviewed with the Commissioners the calendar of upcoming meetings and topics to be discussed.

13. ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date